



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

From the SOCIETY—Proceedings of the Royal Society, No. 95, Vol. 16.

From the ACADEMY—Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de St. Petersburg, Vol. 11, No. III and IV ; Vol. 12, No. I.

From the ACADEMY—Académie Royale de Belgique des Sciences, des Lettres, et des Beaux Arts ; Memoirs, Vol. 36 ; Bulletins, Vol. 23 ; Annuaire, 1867.

From J. FRASER, Esq.—Anonymous, History of John Knox ; J. A. Froude, Influence of the Reformation on the Scottish Character ; Baron Von Feuchtersleben, Principles of Medical Psychology ; Edward Nares, D.D., Man, Theologically and Geologically.

From the AUTHOR—Dr. Hyde Clarke, Address on Geological Surveys.

From Dr. HYDE CLARKE—A. Ubicini, La Turquie Actuelle ; J. R. Morrell, Turkey Past and Present ; Nassif Mollouf, Précis de l'Histoire Ottomane ; Dr. Hyde Clarke, Help to Memory in Learning Turkish ; Quarterly, The Quarterly Levant (January and April, 1861) ; Society, Transactions Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, Copenhagen.

FOR THE MUSEUM.

From Dr. ANT. FRITSCH—seven Bohemian Skulls.

From the Rev. H. CALLAWAY Loc. Sec., A.S.L.—Three Kaffir Skulls, Boxes, Spoons, Combs, Snuff-boxes, Snuff-spoon, various Calabashes.

From WM. THEOBALD, Esq. Loc. Sec. A.S.L. for Rangoon, — Four Birman Skulls.

From J. MEYER HARRIS, Esq.—Eight Negro Skulls.

The CHAIRMAN announced that twenty-seven new members had been proposed for admission into the Society, and would be elected at the next meeting of the Council ; it was evident, therefore, that they were making progress.

The following Report was then read :—

Report on Anthropology at the British Association, 1867. By C. W.

DEVIS, B.A., F.A.S.L., Vice President of the Manchester Anthropological Society.

IN laying before the Anthropological Society of London a report upon the reception given to anthropology at Dundee by the British Association and the people of Scotland, and upon the prospective relations which it has obtained with both those bodies, it is a pleasure to be able to state that the position of the science is in these respects, as in others, entirely satisfactory. It had been apprehended that the British Association would not on this occasion renew the welcome which it extended to anthropology as a specific science at its previous

meeting. The expectation was unfortunately realised, unfortunately for the opponents of anthropology; to its friends one permanent cause of regret alone remains,—the anticipation rendered some eminent anthropologists unwilling to incur the trouble of a journey necessarily long, possibly vain. To the anthropologists whose lot it was to take part in the contest forced upon them the early days of the meeting were full of anxiety and difficulty; annoyance was created among them only as a consequence of the means which they had reason to believe had been adopted for the humiliation of their science. Those means were at the outset eminently successful in placing the official representative of the Anthropological Society of London, Dr. Hunt, in a very embarrassing position. As a member of the committee of Section D to which our science was affiliated at Nottingham, Dr. Hunt might have proposed the formation of a department for the Science of Man under its accepted designation; and, according to a letter which the Rev. H. B. Tristram thought fit to write to the local papers, not only were the authorities of the Association dutifully prepared to receive such a proposal, but accommodation for an anthropological department had been actually provided. Notwithstanding this happy conjugation of the active and passive moods, Dr. Hunt did *not* propose a separate department for anthropology, and for the reasons explained by him in his inaugural address to the Conference. This conjunction of unfavourable circumstances placed insuperable difficulties in the way of anthropology. Even its honest enemies would have been well content to see it undertake a department with the materials mercifully spared to it. The result would have been disastrous alike to its scientific reputation and to its public import. To allow itself to drift unrecognised into the section, and be picked asunder as a scientific waif, would have been to sacrifice the labours of years, and confess that the science of man had neither the unity of purpose nor the consistency of action necessary to constitute a special branch of inquiry. Dr. Hunt had but one other course before him;—to save the credit of anthropology by retaining possession of the papers, and thereby expose himself to the odium, quickly and triumphantly laid upon him, of withdrawing the science from the only section to which it could properly belong. Characteristically, he chose this alternative, and so doing increased his claims to the gratitude of anthropologists. The Local Committee for the reception of Anthropologists, to whom, as the exponents of the friendly feeling of Dundee, the isolation of our science was first announced, received the information with emphatic indignation. At a general meeting of anthropologists, subsequently held, there was entire unanimity in the opinion that they would be wanting, both to themselves and to the common interests of science, if they allowed the non-appointment of their department to pass without an earnest protest. Such a result would have been impossible in any scientific gathering abroad, and British anthropology could not permit itself to be tacitly disgraced in the eyes of its illustrious *confrères*. In simple justice to the Association, which had become unwittingly implicated in a questionable procedure, it was considered that an appeal ought to be made to its broader judg-

ment. An Anthropological Conference was at once decided upon, with the further purpose of enabling the papers to be read, and of thus showing to all whom it might concern that anthropology could, if necessitated, stand alone. The presidency of the conference was accepted by Dr. Hunt; the general arrangements were confided to the Local Committee, to whose zeal and ability at this juncture our science remains largely indebted. The inaugural meeting was held in the Union Hall, Dundee, on Friday, September 6th, the number and character of the audience attesting a wide-spread desire to compare anthropology's account of itself with that which had been so angrily presented to the public by its assailants. In opening the proceedings of the Conference, the President drew the attention of the Association and the public to the aim and method of anthropological science; a full report of the address will be published in the next number of the *Anthropological Review*.

The first meeting of the Conference was productive of the happiest consequences. A very marked change took place in the attitude assumed towards anthropology both within and without the Association. Eminent members of that body immediately confessed that they had previously mistaken the objects and underrated the value of the science. Disapprobation was freely expressed against the feeling which seemed to have instigated its obstructives. Even that portion of the public which still professed hostility, exclaimed that the Association had been placed in a false and untenable position. Whether from this pressure or from other causes, there loomed in the future a prospect of re-entrance into the Association on favourable terms. Anthropology was on its part quite ready to relinquish its vantage ground, on an assurance being given that it would not on future occasions be unnecessarily impeded. It was eventually arranged that at the next meeting of the Association it should have a place in the Association, and that during the current meeting any papers it might be disposed to read should be taken in section E. This recognition of the claims of anthropology once more striven for and won, rendered the discontinuance of the Conference imperative. The general secretaries were therefore requested to draw up an address in explanation of the circumstances attending its dissolution. The following was issued:—

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE DUNDEE ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONFERENCE.

GENTLEMEN,—Before coming to Dundee, we feared that a section of the governing body of the British Association would prevent the introduction of Papers on Anthropology in a distinct department. The non-appointment of an anthropological department in the same manner as last year, together with a report of opinions expressed by some of the officers of section D, assisted to increase this fear. It was under the impression that anthropological science was not being encouraged by some of the authorities that you were called together. Since then, explanations have been made, which show that there has been considerable misunderstanding in the matter, although we are still under the impression that Dr. Hunt was not informed of those

details of intended arrangements to which we consider he was fairly entitled. We are now glad to be able to announce that such explanations have been received as have in a great part removed these suspicions. We are most happy also to be able to state that the enthusiasm and earnestness which were shown by all who took part at the first meeting of the Conference, together with the explanations then made, have produced so favourable an effect, and so much changed the position of anthropologists in the British Association as to leave nothing more to be desired. Arrangements are about to be made by which anthropologists, ethnologists, and geographers will be all united in one section. Should it be necessary at any future time to create a separate department for any one of these sciences, the proposed arrangement would render such change possible, and remove the anomalies which have hitherto existed in the Association. It has been, therefore, decided that the Conference be dissolved, and that the papers announced to be read there be handed over to the British Association. The money received for the sale of tickets will be at once returned. We are fully conscious that the discontinuance of the Conference will cause you much regret; but we trust that the position so long contended for, and now recognised, will compensate for any disappointment you will experience. The Fellows of the London and Manchester Anthropological Societies at present in Dundee beg, through us, warmly to thank all those who have sympathised with their difficulties, and who have thus brought about the desired recognition. The arrangements contemplated for the future will, we believe, be such as finally and satisfactorily to settle a most difficult question, and at the same time unite all students of these allied sciences.—We have the honour to be, gentlemen, your most obedient servants,

JOHN PLANT,

C. W. DEVIS,

General Secretaries, on behalf of the Officers and Executive
Committee to the Dundee Anthropological Conference.

Dundee, 7th Sept., 1867.

During the remainder of the meeting, anthropologists continued to feel content with the provisions held by them for their future incorporation into the Association, but their satisfaction was somewhat modified by circumstances which deprived them of the immediate benefits proposed. With a single exception, none of the papers intended to have been read found their way into section E. Of the difficulties raised, one at least was valid—the section had not time to do justice to its own papers. A captious observer might perhaps have said that even this difficulty was not altogether a necessary one, some of the papers read at the expense of others passed over being old friends to science, though possibly new to Dundee. The plethora of section E shows the absolute necessity of a separate department for a science so rich in materials for discussion as anthropology. To superadd the rest of its branches as well as ethnology to a geographical section would clearly be as impracticable as absurd. Anthropology must either be conducted apart from geography or

ignored altogether ; which of these issues is to become final now rests with its students ; if they be true to themselves, they will in future be received into the Association in a respectful, if not a cordial, spirit ; otherwise, a renewed display of the inveterate hostility banded against them will be encouraged, almost justified.

Though the anthropologists who crossed the border, and their fellow-labourers in Scotland, would have much preferred to enjoy the advantages of collective and definite study, their forced inaction was not altogether profitless : it gave them one more opportunity of observing, and to some extent participating in, the incoherent mode of cultivating man's natural history provided by the Association. Several anthropological subjects of considerable interest were introduced in various sections.

A very valuable accession to archaic anthropology was received from a communication by Mr. Pengelly to the geological section, in which were detailed the results of recent explorations in Kent's cave. He produced a fine series of human relics, including portions of the skeleton, and a variety of implements found associated with the remains of the great carnivora and mammoth. The most highly-finished tools were at the lowest levels. The section received the evidence that in the south of England man was contemporary with the extinct mammals as conclusive, the geological and archæological facts being unmistakably concurrent. In the anatomical department of section D a paper was read, on the "Phenomena of Life and Mind," by Mr. Dunn, who upheld the old distinction between the psychovital and the physical forces, admitting, however, that "we know nothing of life apart from organisation, and have no evidence of mind independent of a brain and nervous system. The agency of matter and the physical forces are as essential to the manifestations of life as life itself is to the display of intelligence." In another paper, on "Life, its Nature, Origin, etc.," by Mr. P. Melville, the theory of the Scotch school on the "vital form or soul" was set forth in opposition to the so-called materialism of Spencer. The author entered at length into the cause of the difference between man and animals, rejecting Professor Huxley's anatomical explanation of the acquirement of speech. After combating the development theory, he concluded that "all facts seem to confirm the opinion that species are never transmuted. They have a definite nature or vital form—call it occult—but you cannot evade it, and Professor Lister may yet prove that 'spontaneous generation' is but the embodiment of vital forms infused in the atmosphere." In the course of the discussion which followed, Dr. Hunt expressed his opinion that the author of the paper had spoken of Professor Huxley under considerable misapprehension of his views.

In Section E a paper was read, by Sir John Lubbock, on the "Early Condition of Man," forming a valuable summary of the arguments in favour of man's primitive barbarism deduced from his present condition. After referring to the diversity of the opinions entertained on this subject, the author proceeded to combat the assertion of Dr. Whately, "that we have no reason to believe that any

community ever did or ever can emerge unassisted by external helps from a state of utter barbarism into anything that can be called civilisation." No instance of this is on record, because Dr. Whately's definition of a savage implies the impossibility of the means of record, and, from the nature of things, the kind of evidence in other respects demanded cannot be adduced. Some savages, as the Australians, have not civilised themselves, because their peculiar circumstances did not permit them to do so. President Smith thought that if man were created a helpless savage, he must have perished before he could have acquired the means of sustaining himself. Exactly the same might be said of the gorilla. There is no evidence for, and much against, the idea that savage man is in a state of degeneration. Many of the simpler domestic arts and religious ideas, which, once possessed, could scarcely be lost, are not universal. Having disposed of the arguments of Whately and his followers, the author showed that there are indications of progress even among savages, and, among the most civilised nations, there are traces of original barbarism. The well-known opinion of Haliburton that the universality of certain beliefs and habits, which are apparently arbitrary, proves their community of origin, was contested, though similarity of custom was considered to prove the original identity of the human mind, and to be therefore an argument for the unity of the human race, which, however, was not necessarily descended from a single pair.

The last day of Section E was rendered remarkable by an announcement, which it was the lot of Sir Roderick Murchison to make, and which will be received by anthropologists with much gratification. The decision of the International Congress to hold its next meeting in this country, which formed the subject of Sir Roderick's communication, cannot fail to have an important influence upon the future of British anthropology. If the Congress be supported, as it will doubtless be, with the zeal with which our science has hitherto been cultivated, it will at once substantiate the claims of anthropology to the respect of men of science generally, and, what is still more desirable, largely increase the materials upon which sound views of archaic humanity can alone be founded. On taking the chair, Sir Roderick said—"I stated yesterday, in speaking shortly on Sir John Lubbock's paper, that those gentlemen who had formed themselves into a Congress for the advancement of all knowledge respecting the pre-historic condition of man, as demonstrated by the implements of art which man must have used being found in association with extinct animals—a subject which has been worked out to a great extent on the Continent, and to some extent in our own country—intended to hold the next meeting of the Congress devoted to that subject in Great Britain in 1868. Before I proceed to say a few words about the progress already made by this institution, and by the several distinguished men who have occupied themselves in these researches, I will read to you a letter which I received the day before yesterday, from the President of this foreign Congress, M. Lartet, a most eminent comparative anatomist, and one well-known to every man of science who occupies himself with natural history. He has a Euro-

pean reputation, and he is now the President of the Pre-Historic Congress of France. M. Lartet thus writes:—‘I have the honour to inform you that in the meeting of the 29th August last, the International Congress of Anthropology and Pre-Historic Archæology, holding its session at Paris for the year 1867, adopted the proposition of holding its next session in England in the year 1868. At the same meeting the members of the Congress resolved to offer to you the Presidency of this session in 1868, and to associate with you the names of Sir Charles Lyell, Sir John Lubbock, Messrs. J. Evans, A. Franks, J. Prestwich, G. Busk, Carter Blake, etc., in order to form the nucleus of a committee of organisation, which is to be charged with determining the place of meeting of the Congress, and to regulate the conditions under which its sittings are to be held. All the documents relating to the foundation of this Congress at La Spezzia in 1865, to the next session at Neuchatel in 1866, and to its session in Paris in 1867, will be sent to you.’ The first thing I did on receiving this letter was to write immediately to M. Lartet, and to tell him that I was not the person by any means entitled to preside over a Congress of this nature. I immediately adverted to Sir Charles Lyell, to Sir John Lubbock, and to those other distinguished men who have written books upon the subject, whose books have circulated through the land, and who have given up a very large portion of their time to the consideration of this important subject, whereas I, who am a simple geologist, and I hope something of a geographer also, have always been occupied in developing the condition of the earliest animals that are found in the crust of the globe, and therefore I have been working at the other end of the geological scale, while these pre-historic inquirers are working at the very highest and last epoch in any way connected with geological science. Consequently, I do not feel that I would be the fittest man to occupy the presidential chair, though I have a hearty wish to promote this inquiry, because it is only by an inquiry into facts, not in our own country only, for in our own country man was in a barbarous state when other countries were having a high civilisation, but by a general inquiry, extended to all parts of the world, that we can arrive at proper and sound inference on this important subject. The announcement which I have now made has no direct connection with the business of the British Association—it is simply an announcement of a Congress which has the most intimate relations with that great subject on which Sir John Lubbock addressed you yesterday; and I make it here so that it may receive as much publicity as possible, in order that those foreign gentlemen may be sure of a proper welcome in this country when they come here.”

In turning to the subject of the status acquired by anthropology among the people of Scotland, reference must first be made to the extraordinary public interest which awaited its advent. Curiosity, well and ill-disposed, was greatly excited. The unfortunate circumstances which led to the rupture of the previous relations of the science to the British Association were instantly made the subject of general comment. Those who are acquainted with the prevailing tone

given to Scotch opinion might expect that the separation of anthropology from the Association would have been welcomed with something akin to exultation. So far from this, conduct, which appeared attributable either to caprice or compliance, was blamed on all sides. The fact that anthropology was unwillingly and unnecessarily outside the pale of the Association at Dundee, whether by overt exclusion or covert prevention, was at once contrasted by the public with its acceptance at Nottingham, where its proceedings obtained scientific approval. The first cheering sign which met the southern anthropologist was that the intolerance attributed to the Scot is insufficient to allow him to tolerate unfairness. Though the reflections cast upon the Association were no doubt in some respects undeserved, it cannot be denied that they were apparently justified by the circumstances under which the meeting at Dundee took place. The public mind at once concluded that the Association had discarded anthropology from a prudent resolve to stand well with their Scotch hosts. Various speakers in the sections took opportunities of declaring, on behalf of the Association at large, that elsewhere scientific statements had never been rejected on account of their tendency. These disclaimers did not, however, appear to remove the impression that the Dundee meeting was in this respect exceptional. For a twelvemonth past it had been well known in the south that sectarian prejudice was being bitterly aroused by certain zealots against the latitudinarianism of science in general and anthropology in particular, and there were sufficient indications given that on Scotch soil the effect of scientific induction on theological doctrine would be watched with jealous reserve—a conflict between the two with positive hostility. If general opinion were correct in believing that this foreknowledge had influence over the minds of any members of the Association as they journeyed northward—if those members really were persuaded that the public favour, and even the presidential smile, would be jeopardised by a scientific licence reputable in lower latitudes—if they were conscious that science generally sins against popular orthodoxy, and that on this occasion anthropology would be a convenient scape-goat to be sent into the wilderness—if feeling so unworthy the dignity of science could possibly be supposed to actuate them—they were rudely undeceived by finding that they had perverted a crime into a blunder. Scotch candour refused the victim offered to its austerity. No anthropologist could have devised a more thorough preparation for the introduction of his science into Scotland than has been given by its enemies, scientific and priestly. Scotchmen saw it, or believed they saw it, put aside by the Association on their account, and their sympathies went with it. They heard it appeal without reserve to their common sense and liberality, and felt how hugely it had been misrepresented by well-meaning friends; how deeply maligned by ignorant or unscrupulous enemies. Above all, the Scot has had abundant opportunities of testing the worthlessness of their judgment who rave about the unscientific nature of anthropology. He has been shown that it has all the elements and obeys all the laws of a true science, and, if true, then the noblest of all. Anthropology is engaging Scotch attention

at a juncture no less favourable to its establishment than the circumstances which heralded it. To any one who reads the signs of the times, the Scotch mind appears in a transition state. The imperceptible approach of the wave of modern education is gradually undermining the old landmarks of bigotry, and the practice of the Puritan is becoming irksome. Public intelligence is growing uneasy in swaddling clothes unsuited to its larger growth, and the mind of Knox is no longer supreme. The most authentic evidence we could have of this we gather from the indignant remonstrances of Scotchmen against the English notion that free thought is tabooed to them. A gentleman, for example, gives a Christian Young Men's Association his ideas of the British Association, and, while lecturing the young men, falls a scolding anthropologists thus: "Funniest of all was the absurdity of the anthropologists as they made vain efforts to get the glory of martyrdom, and made a false fuss over the narrowness of the Scotch. They seem to fancy that we are such a set of miserable bigots as to be unable to listen to anything that does not square with our own theories. It would be wrong in me not to state, however, that several of these papers open up strange and new fields of inquiry, and I would say to young men inquire, read, do not be dogmatic." Reminding the lecturer, in passing, that it was not the anthropologists, but their opponents, who are supposed to have taken the good people of Dundee for "miserable bigots," we accept his testimony, in conjunction with that of others, that the Scotch mind is disposed to free inquiry, and is weaning itself from dogmatism. We accept it the more willingly, because we see in it the best grounds of hope that Scotch anthropology will take root and flourish, for it is to the science of humanity that the eye will be directed as the fading outlines of dogmatic teaching sink more and more below the horizon. There is, indeed, reason to think that the reputation for narrow views which Scotland undoubtedly has, is, in respect to its educated classes, in a great measure factitious. Scotch orthodoxy is very loud in its self-assertion, as well as very relentless towards offending railway directors and journeymen printers, but in its denunciations we listen not so much to the voice of public opinion as to the thunders of a northern Sinai. The fanaticism of the priesthood becomes the opprobrium of the people. The nation is too tightly held in the ecclesiastical embrace for the liberality inseparable from intellectual power to relieve itself without a struggle; and though the natural acumen of the Scot cannot avoid recognising the discordance between the modes of thought required by his spiritual regimen and those necessitated by scientific culture, his characteristic prudence deprecates a collision with his hierarchy, and he seldom exercises the perilous right of speaking for himself. This state of things cannot last long. The Scotch mind is eminently adapted to scientific inquiry, an education incompatible with intellectual feudalism. No country of equal extent has produced a greater number of patient workers and illustrious discoverers—men whose genius has illuminated every department of knowledge—men who have not hesitated to seize the truth wherever they found it, irrespective of prejudices, whether their own or their neighbours'. Common experience

shows the strong tendency towards scientific activity amongst educated Scotchmen. This only requires to be duly attracted towards anthropology for it to receive from them the attention and respect which it deserves. Thanks to its ill-wishers, that attraction has taken place so far as it could be effected by their clamours. Sounder and more abundant results will follow as soon as Scotchmen see that their enterprise abroad can supply many of the wants most sensibly felt in the science of man, and that their own country is peculiarly rich in subjects of anthropological investigation. A society for the study of anthropology has already been formed by the friends who fought so spiritedly by our side at Dundee, and every lover of the science will rejoice if the favourable anticipations of the prosecution of anthropological science in Scotland, derived from experience of the late meeting, be furthered in its fulfilment by the labours of this youngest colleague of our society.

Thanks were unanimously given to the writer of the Report.

Dr. HUNT explained the reasons why he did not propose formally that there should be a separate department for anthropology at the meeting of the British Association, and why it was thought proper that Mr. Devis should write the report of what occurred, as an independent member of the Society. There had been in former years a long struggle to get anthropology recognised at the meetings of the Association. At Nottingham an arrangement was entered into, under the influence of Professor Huxley, by which anthropology was separately recognised as a department of biology, though it was not an arrangement with which he (Dr. Hunt) was satisfied, and he declared at the time that the separation of anthropology from ethnology into two distinct departments would only be temporary. The result was that several of the papers read were identical, and same subjects were discussed in different sections at the same time. The report which had been read would explain why that arrangement, which he had considered temporary, had not been continued; and, thanks to those gentlemen who were on the Local Reception Committee of Anthropologists at Dundee, the science of man would occupy a much more favourable position at subsequent meetings of the British Association. But for them, he believed, anthropology would have been very differently received. The magistrates and a great portion of the people of Dundee thought that anthropology had been unfairly treated, and they resented the imputation that they were too prejudiced to enter into free inquiry. There could be no doubt that the prospects of the science were much better than they were before the meeting, and they were indebted for that improved position to the exertions of the people of Dundee in their behalf. He concluded by proposing the thanks of the Society to the Reception Committee at Dundee.

Mr. MACKENZIE congratulated the Society on the fact that they had conciliated the Scotch, which he considered a most remarkable event. How it was done he did not know. He felt assured, however, that if the study of anthropology were properly understood in Scotland, it would find cordial acceptance from all classes in that country.

He seconded the motion for the reason, that, if properly understood, anthropology was the most important study to which man could devote himself. He was glad to find that, though encountering remarkable difficulties, it had established itself at Dundee.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. BRABROOK then moved the thanks of the Society to Dr. Hunt for the manner in which he had dealt with the subject at Dundee. He said they ought to congratulate themselves on having had such an able representative on that occasion.

Mr. CONRAD COX seconded.

The CHAIRMAN said he had often admired Dr. Hunt's courage and ability in fighting in support of the claims of the Society before the British Association.

Dr. HUNT, in returning thanks for the compliment, remarked on the victory which the Society had gained at Dundee, where, with a small force, they had overcome the opposition of a large body; but he said the support received from the local authorities and the justice of their cause had carried the day.

The CHAIRMAN observed, in reference to the paper about to be read, that they were all aware that Captain Bedford Pim had some years since showed the practicability of constructing a railway across the Isthmus of Nicaragua, to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The scheme was at first regarded as incapable of being realised, and several eminent men had been sent out with the view of placing the practicability of the project beyond doubt. Mr. John Collinson, the author of the paper, had effected a survey of a part of the country but little known, and in doing so had had much communication with the natives, an account of whom he would now place before them.

Mr. JOHN COLLINSON, C.E., F.R.G.S., read a paper "On the Indians of the Mosquito Territory." [Abstract. The paper will appear at length in the *Memoirs*.]

The author enumerated seven distinct tribes, viz., Mosquitos, Woolwas, Ramas, Valientes, Cookwas, Tongas, and Poyas, but confined his remarks to the three following:—Mosquitos proper, Woolwas, and Ramas. The Mosquitos he considered the most intelligent and enlightened of all, and their superiority was due to the indefatigable efforts of the Moravian missionaries, who directed their efforts, in the first instance, to their civilisation and to the abolition of their barbarous ceremonies. Their stature is short, never exceeding five feet eight inches; they are strongly built, and possess considerable powers of endurance; complexion dark, with finely-marked features; small noses; high cheek-bones; and long, coarse, black hair. The chief of the entire territory must be of the Mosquito tribe, and reigns by direct descent through the male line. The last chief had received a good education, and evinced refined taste, and fondness for the best English poets; his word was law, which was enforced with severity, and yet he was regarded with much affection by his people.

The Woolwas live an exceedingly barbarous life. Among their customs, that of flattening the head in infancy is prevalent. This